



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/758,185

01/14/2004

Scott Bernard Marcak

200314404

5594

22879

7590

08/18/2006

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PUENTE, EMERSON C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2113

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/758,185	Applicant(s) MARCAK ET AL.	
	Examiner Emerson C. Puente	Art Unit 2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/14/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is made **Non-Final**.

Claims 1-20 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. A software product, without the computer-readable medium needed to realize the computer program's functionality, constitutes nonstatutory subject matter. See MPEP § 2106. Examiner suggests amending “A software product ...” to “A software product stored on a computer readable medium ...” (see line 1 of claim 8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-10, 13-15, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,884,075 of Hester et al. referred hereinafter “Hester”.

Examiner notes that Harper (see column 3 lines 21-25) incorporates by reference US Patent No. 5,450,570 of Richek et al. referred hereinafter "Richek", which is introduced in the rejection below.

In regard to claim 1, Hester discloses a method of Power On Self Test resource conflict detection and reporting (see column 3 lines 17-21) comprising the steps of:

dynamically assigning resources to provide electronic access to devices physically attached to a computer system (see column 1 lines 51-58);

reading the state of a flag indicative of a user-selected compatibility mode requiring at least partial reallocation of resources. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21). The pressing of the F10 button would necessarily result in a setting of a flag indicative of a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode). This flag would need to be read in order to enter the user-selected compatibility mode.

if the flag is in a first state and one or more devices will become inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources, generating at least one message indicative of a resource conflict. Hester discloses a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode) (see column 3 lines 17-21), indicating the flag is in a first state. Hester further discloses if the conflict cannot be resolved, the present invention will notify the user that it cannot be resolved (see column 2 lines 51-54 of Richek), indicating if one or more devices will become inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources, generating at least one message indicative of a resource conflict;

reallocating at least some of the resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21).

In regard to claim 4, Hester discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses wherein the step of generating at least one message indicative of a resource conflict comprises generating at least one message indicating that at least one device is inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources required by the user-selected compatibility mode. Hester discloses attempting to resolve conflicts by assigning alternate resources (see column 2 lines 44-46 of Richek) and if the conflict cannot be resolved, notifying the user that the conflict cannot be resolved (see column 2 lines 51-54 of Richek).

In regard to claim 5, Hester discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses wherein the step of generating at least one message indicative of a resource conflict comprises generating at least one message for a predetermined period of time. Hester discloses if it is determined the conflict may not be resolved, displaying a nonresolvable conflict message before quitting (see figure 14A-2 item 1453,1469 and column 46 lines 50-52 of Richek). A period of time to generate at least one message must be predetermined in order for the system to know when to quit.

In regard to claim 8, Hester discloses a software product including one or more computer executable instructions for performing a power on self test (see column 3 lines 17-21), the software product comprising:

first computer executable instructions that cause a computer to dynamically assign resources to provide electronic access to devices physically connected to the computer (see column 1 lines 51-58);

second computer executable instructions that cause a computer to read the state of a flag indicative of a user-selected compatibility mode requiring at least partial reallocation of resources. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21). The pressing of the F10 button would necessarily result in a setting of a flag indicative of a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode). This flag would need to be read in order to enter the user-selected compatibility mode.

third computer executable instructions that generate at least one message indicative of a resource conflict if the flag is in a first state and one or more devices will become inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources. Hester discloses a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode), indicating the flag is in a first state. Hester further discloses if the conflict cannot be resolved, the present invention will notify the user that it cannot be resolved (see column 2 lines 51-54 of Richek), indicating if one or more devices will become inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources, generating at least one message indicative of a resource conflict;

fourth computer executable instructions that reallocate at least some resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21).

In regard to claim 9, Hester discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses wherein the third computer executable instructions that generate at least one message indicative of a resource conflict comprises instructions that generate at least one message indicating that at least one device is inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources required by the user-selected compatibility mode. Hester discloses attempting to resolve conflicts by assigning alternate resources (see column 2 lines 44-46 of Richek) and if the conflict cannot be resolved, notifying the user that the conflict cannot be resolved (see column 2 lines 51-54 of Richek).

In regard to claim 10, Hester discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses wherein the third computer executable instructions that generate at least one message indicative of a resource conflict comprises instructions that generate the at least one message for a predetermined period of time. Hester discloses if it is determined the conflict may not be resolved, displaying a nonresolvable conflict message before quitting (see figure 14A-2 item 1453,1469 and column 46 lines 50-52 of Richek). A period of time to generate at least one message must be predetermined in order for the system to know when to quit.

In regard to claim 13, Hester disclose a computer system comprising:

- a CPU (see column 1 lines 31-35),
- a memory (see column 1 lines 31-35),
- at least one input/output bus (see column 1 lines 41-44),
- a board input/output system including logic for performing a power on self test (see column 3 lines 17-21), the power on self test logic comprising instructions that cause the CPU to

dynamically assign resources to provide electronic access to devices physically connected to the at least one input/output bus (see column 1 lines 51-58);

to read the state of a flag indicative of a user-selected compatibility mode requiring at least partial reallocation of resources. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21). The pressing of the F10 button would necessarily result in a setting of a flag indicative of a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode). This flag would need to be read in order to enter the user-selected compatibility mode.

to generate at least one message indicative of a resource conflict if the flag is in a first state and one or more devices will become inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources. Hester discloses a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode), indicating the flag is in a first state. Hester further discloses if the conflict cannot be resolved, the present invention will notify the user that it cannot be resolved (see column 2 lines 51-54 of Richek), indicating if one or more devices will become inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources, generating at least one message indicative of a resource conflict;

to reallocate at least some resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21).

In regard to claim 14, Hester discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses wherein the instructions to generate at least one message indicative of a resource conflict comprises instructions that generate at least one message indicating that at least one device is inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources required by the user-selected

compatibility mode. Hester discloses attempting to resolve conflicts by assigning alternate resources (see column 2 lines 44-46 of Richek) and if the conflict cannot be resolved, notifying the user that the conflict cannot be resolved (see column 2 lines 51-54 of Richek).

In regard to claim 15, Hester discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses wherein the instructions to generate at least one message indicative of a resource conflict comprises instructions that generate the at least one message for a predetermined period of time. Hester discloses if it is determined the conflict may not be resolved, displaying a nonresolvable conflict message before quitting (see figure 14A-2 item 1453,1469 and column 46 lines 50-52 of Richek). A period of time to generate at least one message must be predetermined in order for the system to know when to quit.

In regard to claim 18, Hester discloses a resource conflict detecting system comprising:
means for dynamically assigning resources to provide electronic access to devices physically attached to a computer system (see column 1 lines 51-58);

means for reading the state of a flag indicative of a user-selected compatibility mode requiring at least partial reallocation of resources. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21). The pressing of the F10 button would necessarily result in a setting of a flag indicative of a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode). This flag would need to be read in order to enter the user-selected compatibility mode.

means for determining if the flag is in a first state and one or more devices will become inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources and generating at least one message indicative of

Art Unit: 2113

a resource conflict. Hester discloses a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode), indicating the flag is in a first state. Hester further discloses if the conflict cannot be resolved, the present invention will notify the user that it cannot be resolved (see column 2 lines 51-54 of Richek), indicating if one or more devices will become inaccessible due to the reallocation of resources, generating at least one message indicative of a resource conflict;

means for reallocating at least some of the resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21).

In regard to claim 19, Hester discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses means for determining if the flag is in a second state and bypassing user resource conflict message generation. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21). The pressing of the F10 button would necessarily result in a setting of a flag indicative of a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode). Thus, if the F10 button is not pressed, indicating a second state, then the mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode) would not be entered, indicating bypassing user resource conflict message generation.

In regard to claim 20, Hester discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses means for reading compatibility mode set-up data. Hester discloses pressing F10 upon a POST sequence so that each resource value can be altered until a conflict-free environment is established (see column 3 lines 17-21). The pressing of the F10 button would

necessarily result in a setting of a flag indicative of a mode wherein each resource value can be altered (user-selected compatibility mode). This flag would need to be read in order to enter the user-selected compatibility mode, indicating reading compatibility mode set-up data.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2,3,6,7,11,12, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. **103(a)** as being unpatentable over Hester (which incorporates by reference Richek) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art referred hereinafter "AAPA".

In regard to claim 2, Hester discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses configuring circuit boards by assigning computer system resources (see column 1 lines 50-60). However, Hester fails to explicitly disclose:

wherein the step of dynamically assigning resources to provide electronic access to devices physically attached to a computer system comprises configuring at least one parallel AT attachment sub-system.

AAPA discloses wherein parallel AT attachments (PATA) interfaces are configured by assigning computer's resources based on the needs of the system components including the mass storage devices connected to the interface (see page 2 paragraph 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hester and AAPA wherein the circuit boards are PATA interfaces, thus indicating dynamically assigning resources to provide electronic access to devices physically attached to a computer system comprises configuring at least one parallel AT attachment sub-system. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings because Hester discloses circuit boards that are configuring by assigning computer system resources (see column 1 lines 50-60), and a PATA interface, as per teachings of AAPA, constitute known circuit boards that are configured by being assigned computer system resources (see page 2 paragraph 4). Furthermore, AAPA is concerned with allocating resources to a PATA sub-system (see page 2 paragraph 4) and being able to alter resources, as per teachings of Hester (see column 1 lines 50-60), would resolve system conflicts during the allocation of resources to a PATA sub-system.

In regard to claim 3, Hester discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses configuring circuit boards by assigning computer system resources (see column 1 lines 50-60). However, Hester fails to explicitly disclose:

wherein the step of dynamically assigning resources to provide electronic access to devices physically attached to a computer system comprises configuring at least one serial AT attachment sub-system.

AAPA discloses wherein serial AT attachments (SATA) interfaces are configured by assigning computer's resources based on the needs of the system components including the mass storage devices connected to the interface (see page 2 paragraph 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hester and AAPA wherein the circuit boards are SATA interfaces, thus indicating dynamically assigning resources to provide electronic access to devices physically attached to a computer system comprises configuring at least one serial AT attachment sub-system. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings because Hester discloses circuit boards that are configuring by assigning computer system resources (see column 1 lines 50-60), and a SATA interface, as per teachings of AAPA, constitute known circuit boards that are configured by being assigned computer system resources (see page 2 paragraph 4). Furthermore, AAPA is concerned with allocating resources to a SATA sub-system (see page 2 paragraph 4) and being able to alter resources, as per teachings of Hester (see column 1 lines 50-60), would resolve system conflicts during the allocation of resources to a SATA sub-system.

In regard to claims 6, Hester discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses configuring circuit boards by assigning computer system resources (see column 1 lines 50-60). However, Hester fails to explicitly disclose:

wherein reallocating resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode comprises reconfiguring at least one parallel AT attachment sub-system.

AAPA discloses wherein parallel AT attachments (PATA) interfaces are configured by assigning computer's resources based on the needs of the system components including the mass storage devices connected to the interface (see page 2 paragraph 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hester and AAPA wherein the circuit boards are PATA

Art Unit: 2113

interfaces, thus indicating reallocating resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode comprises reconfiguring at least one parallel AT attachment sub-system. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings because Hester discloses circuit boards that are configuring by assigning computer system resources (see column 1 lines 50-60), and a PATA interface, as per teachings of AAPA, constitute known circuit boards that are configured by being assigned computer system resources (see page 2 paragraph 4). Furthermore, AAPA is concerned with allocating resources to a PATA sub-system (see page 2 paragraph 4) and being able to alter resources, as per teachings of Hester (see column 1 lines 50-60), would resolve system conflicts during the allocation of resources to a PATA sub-system.

In regard to claim 7, Hester discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses configuring circuit boards by assigning computer system resources (see column 1 lines 50-60). However, Hester fails to explicitly disclose:

wherein reallocating resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode comprises reconfiguring at least one serial AT attachment sub-system.

AAPA discloses wherein serial AT attachments (SATA) interfaces are configured by assigning computer's resources based on the needs of the system components including the mass storage devices connected to the interface (see page 2 paragraph 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hester and AAPA wherein the circuit boards are SATA interfaces, thus indicating reallocating resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode comprises reconfiguring at least one serial AT attachment sub-system. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings because Hester

discloses circuit boards that are configuring by assigning computer system resources (see column 1 lines 50-60), and a SATA interface, as per teachings of AAPA, constitute known circuit boards that are configured by being assigned computer system resources (see page 2 paragraph 4).

Furthermore, AAPA is concerned with allocating resources to a SATA sub-system (see page 2 paragraph 4) and being able to alter resources, as per teachings of Hester (see column 1 lines 50-60), would resolve system conflicts during the allocation of resources to a SATA sub-system.

In regard to claims 11, Hester discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses configuring circuit boards by assigning computer system resources (see column 1 lines 50-60). However, Hester fails to explicitly disclose:

wherein the fourth computer executable instructions that reallocate at least some resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode comprises instructions that reconfigure at least one parallel AT attachment sub-system.

AAPA discloses wherein parallel AT attachments (PATA) interfaces are configured by assigning computer's resources based on the needs of the system components including the mass storage devices connected to the interface (see page 2 paragraph 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hester and AAPA wherein the circuit boards are PATA interfaces, thus indicating reallocating at least some resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode comprises instructions that reconfigure at least one parallel AT attachment sub-system. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings because Hester discloses circuit boards that are configuring by assigning computer system resources (see column 1 lines 50-60), and a PATA interface, as per teachings of AAPA,

constitute known circuit boards that are configured by being assigned computer system resources (see page 2 paragraph 4). Furthermore, AAPA is concerned with allocating resources to a PATA sub-system (see page 2 paragraph 4) and being able to alter resources, as per teachings of Hester (see column 1 lines 50-60), would resolve system conflicts during the allocation of resources to a PATA sub-system.

In regard to claim 12, Hester discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses configuring circuit boards by assigning computer system resources (see column 1 lines 50-60). However, Hester fails to explicitly disclose:

wherein the fourth computer executable instructions that reallocate at least some resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode comprises instructions that reconfigure at least one serial AT attachment sub-system.

AAPA discloses wherein serial AT attachments (SATA) interfaces are configured by assigning computer's resources based on the needs of the system components including the mass storage devices connected to the interface (see page 2 paragraph 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hester and AAPA wherein the circuit boards are SATA interfaces, thus indicating reallocating at least some resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode comprises instructions that reconfigure at least one serial AT attachment sub-system. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings because Hester discloses circuit boards that are configuring by assigning computer system resources (see column 1 lines 50-60), and a SATA interface, as per teachings of AAPA, constitute known circuit boards that are configured by being assigned computer system resources

(see page 2 paragraph 4). Furthermore, AAPA is concerned with allocating resources to a SATA sub-system (see page 2 paragraph 4) and being able to alter resources, as per teachings of Hester (see column 1 lines 50-60), would resolve system conflicts during the allocation of resources to a SATA sub-system.

In regard to claims 16, Hester discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses configuring circuit boards by assigning computer system resources (see column 1 lines 50-60). However, Hester fails to explicitly disclose:

wherein the instructions that reallocate resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode comprises instructions that reconfigure at least one parallel AT attachment sub-system.

AAPA discloses wherein parallel AT attachments (PATA) interfaces are configured by assigning computer's resources based on the needs of the system components including the mass storage devices connected to the interface (see page 2 paragraph 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hester and AAPA wherein the circuit boards are PATA interfaces, thus indicating reallocating resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode comprises instructions that reconfigure at least one parallel AT attachment sub-system. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings because Hester discloses circuit boards that are configuring by assigning computer system resources (see column 1 lines 50-60), and a PATA interface, as per teachings of AAPA, constitute known circuit boards that are configured by being assigned computer system resources (see page 2 paragraph 4). Furthermore, AAPA is concerned with allocating resources to a PATA sub-system

Art Unit: 2113

(see page 2 paragraph 4) and being able to alter resources, as per teachings of Hester (see column 1 lines 50-60), would resolve system conflicts during the allocation of resources to a PATA sub-system.

In regard to claim 17, Hester discloses the claim limitations as discussed above. Hester further discloses configuring circuit boards by assigning computer system resources (see column 1 lines 50-60). However, Hester fails to explicitly disclose:

wherein the instructions that reallocate resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode comprises instructions that reconfigure at least one serial AT attachment sub-system.

AAPA discloses wherein serial AT attachments (SATA) interfaces are configured by assigning computer's resources based on the needs of the system components including the mass storage devices connected to the interface (see page 2 paragraph 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hester and AAPA wherein the circuit boards are SATA interfaces, thus indicating reallocating resources according to the user-selected compatibility mode comprises instructions that reconfigure at least one serial AT attachment sub-system. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings because Hester discloses circuit boards that are configuring by assigning computer system resources (see column 1 lines 50-60), and a SATA interface, as per teachings of AAPA, constitute known circuit boards that are configured by being assigned computer system resources (see page 2 paragraph 4). Furthermore, AAPA is concerned with allocating resources to a SATA sub-system (see page 2 paragraph 4) and being able to alter resources, as per teachings of Hester (see column

Art Unit: 2113

1 lines 50-60), would resolve system conflicts during the allocation of resources to a SATA sub-system.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

See Form PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emerson C. Puente whose telephone number is (571) 272-3652. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert W. Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Emerson Puente
Examiner
AU 2113